



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,177	02/24/2004	Ha-Yeong Yang	1594.1335	9278
21171	7590	04/06/2005	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ALI, MOHAMMAD M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3744	

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/784,177	Applicant(s) YANG, HA-YEONG	
	Examiner Mohammad Ali	Art Unit 3744	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 February 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/24/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "coil" for claim 7, "electrical heating wire" for claim 8, "gas combustion" for claim 9 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Art Unit: 3744

Claims 1-6, 11, 13-14, 16-19, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Watenable (JP 2003-79519 A). Watenable discloses a cooking apparatus 13 comprising a casing forming an enclosure of the cooking apparatus 13; and a temperature adjusting unit/ cooking plate 11 mounted on the casing, with an upper portion thereof protruding from an upper surface on the casing on which food is placed, wherein the temperature adjusting unit exchanging heat with the food to heat or cool the food, a peltier element 13, a heat sink with heat emitting pins 16, a ventilation fan 17, a temperature sensor 18 a temperature setter 19 and a controller 20, the peltier element 13 also comprising with reversible endoergic 15 and exothermic 15 sides.. See 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 7-8, 10 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanable in view of Michel (FR 2604882 A1). Watanable discloses the invention substantially as claimed as stated above. However, Watanable does not disclose induction heating. Michel teaches combined heating system of induction heating and thermoelectric or Peltier heatin/cooling device in a cooking apparatus for the purpose of cooking and temperature control of food items. See Fig.1 and the translated abstract. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cooking apparatus of Watanable in view of Michel such that an induction heating system could be combined with the Peltier cooking system of Watanable in order to provide dual heating system.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanable in view of Hanaki (JP 2003274680 A). Watanable discloses the invention substantially as claimed as stated above. However, Watanable does not disclose gas heating. Hanaki teaches combined heating system of gas heating and thermoelectric or Peltier heatin/cooling device in a cooking apparatus for the purpose of cooking and temperature control of food items. See Fig.2 and the translated abstract and solution.

Art Unit: 3744

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cooking apparatus of Watanable in view of Hanaki such that an gas heating system could be combined with the Peltier cooking system of Watanable in order to provide dual heating system.


Claims 12, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanable in view of Chauchy (US 6,282,906). Watable discloses the invention substantially as claimed as stated above. However, Watanable does not disclose DC power supply. Cauchy teaches the use of DC power supply in a peltier or thermoelectric food heating cooling system heating system of for the purpose of cooking and temperature control of food items. See Fig.4, and column 4, lines 34-35. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cooking apparatus of Watanable in view of Cauchy such that DC power could be provided in order to operate the peltier/thermoelectric food temperature control apparatus.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad Ali whose telephone number is 703-308-5032. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Esquivel Denise can be reached on 703-308-2597. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3744

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Mohammad M. Ali
March 28, 2005